

**SOUTH COAST CORRIDOR MULTI - MODAL STUDY**  
**STEERING GROUP**  
**25 June 2002**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**Those Present:**

Charlotte Dixon (Chair)	Government Office for the South East	Mark Froud	Sussex Enterprise
Andrew Cleaver	Government Office for the South East	Tony Cook	SEAPLAG
Lee Sambrook	Government Office for the South East	Kevin Travers	Hampshire County Council
Nicola Brooker	Government Office for the South East	Bob Wilkins	East Sussex County Council
Mick Sutch	Kent County Council	Matthew Lodge	Strategic Rail Authority
Derrick Coffee	South East Forum for Sustainability	Andy Renaut	Brighton and Hove City Council
Colin Murray	South East Forum for Sustainability	Ian Dalton	DTLR MMSU
Lindsay Gardner	Regional Assembly	Andrew Dyer	Confederation of Passenger Transport
Colin Mc Kenna	West Sussex County Council	Bernie Miles	Southampton City Council
Sue Moody	Freight Transport Association		

**CONSULTANTS**

David Turner	Paul Stelmszczyk
Ros Atterwill	Ros Atterwill
Mark Brown	Stuart Fox
Paul Read	Simon Allan
Heather Pope	
Nicole Gagen	

**Chair's welcome and introductions**

1. Minutes of the last meeting were tabled and agreed.

**Progress Report**

2. A progress note had been previously circulated. The steering group were asked to consider whether:

- There should be a final study newsletter;
- Proposals for the structure of the final report;

It was agreed that, subject to project finances, a final study newsletter should be developed by the consultants. The consultant's proposed structure for the final report was also agreed as acceptable.

3. The consultants agreed that hard copies of the strategy development and appraisal reports would be finalised and distributed soon, but noted that these currently are reliant on outputs from the Strategy development plan (SDP) work. The consultants also confirmed that, where practicable, they will develop separate AST tables for each of the strategy development plans.

4. Whilst the need for appraisal of the whole corridor strategy was noted, SRA also noted a need for the appraisal of individual rail elements of the study.

5. Considerable discussion followed on the interpretation of the Appraisal document. The following points were considered:

- Concern was expressed over some of the negative environmental impacts of the strategy as expressed in the strategy appraisal document. Whilst it was accepted that the style of reporting is inclined to accentuate negative environmental impacts, it was also noted that the consultants should seek to minimise / mitigate against negative environmental impacts in their ongoing strategy development plan work;
- The consultants outlined the approach to consultation with the statutory environmental bodies. A meeting has already been held with these bodies to consider the strategy appraisal work, and further meetings are to be scheduled as the strategy and SDP appraisal progresses;

- It was agreed that the strategy development report should be strengthened to justify the reasons why the negative environmental consequences of specific schemes might be understood to be acceptable within the context of the broader strategy benefits. The need to tie in the strategy with the emerging RTS and a corridor wide vision was similarly stressed.
- The need to fully consider buses in the public transport proposals was noted, particularly as these are seen to cater well for local trips. It was also noted that the local need for PT proposals will best be demonstrated through the Strategy development plan work;
- The consultants outlined that they have also undertaken the tests requested on area wide charging, but these still need to be interpreted. It was agreed that they should provide feedback on these in the near future.
- A concern was expressed that the discussion of rail freight in the strategy reporting is weak, and also that the justification for the inclusion of M27 schemes is seen to be fairly weak. The consultants were asked to further consider this.

6. It was also agreed that the consultants are to provide more detail on the on-going strategy development plan work at a steering group meeting of 4 July. The meeting is to be held as an all steering group meeting, with the consultants presenting a timed discussion for each of the strategy development plans.

7. The consultants agreed to work up a first draft of the strategy final report for circulation prior to the meeting of 4 July, time permitting.

## **Consultation Feedback**

### *Wider Consultation Inputs*

8. The consultants outlined that the consultation period officially finished on 21 June, although noted that provision has been made for receiving some agreed late responses. At this stage 1300 questionnaire replies had been received, along with 300 written replies, and 200 website responses. Attendees at the consultation road shows numbered over 2000 people. Key messages emerging from this consultation were as follows:

- General appreciation of a balanced strategy;
- Support for a realistic implementation process (focus on responsibility, accountability, financial and political support);
- Assurance of the need for the right level of investment and return for the taxpayer;
- Expectation of more detail on local issues;
- Strong concern for economic growth and regeneration issues;
- Strong concern over parking charges, levy on private workplace parking and car based cordon charges;
- Level of scepticism – concerning the level of investment (perception favouring road over sustainable modes)
- Environmental groups – strong views rejecting all major road expansion and park and ride provision
- Preservation of countryside and AONB's

### *Workshop Input*

9. A short summary of the input from the consultation workshops was also presented. The consultants indicated that there was a good mix of attendees at the workshops, and that overall attendees amounted to approximately 250 people. A number of general points were felt to have emerged from this part of consultation:

- Wide support for a mixed and balanced strategy

- Public Transport proposals supported – priority
- Suggestions for a Public Transport Authority?
- Very little support for a Motorway

**However Concerns emerged over:**

- Implementation
- Cordon, Tolling and Parking Charges
- Desire for more cost and benefit information
- Many local issues

The importance of the high level of co-operation being required in strategy delivery was also noted.

10. A concern was expressed from within the steering group that the responses to the workshops, in particular, should not be seen as carrying too much weight. It was argued that the number of respondents was felt to have been too small to be considered as representative. It was, however, also noted that the input reflects only a single element of the total consultation response.

*Quantified Acceptability Surveys*

11. The consultant outlined that a random sample of 500 individuals who live in the corridor has also been conducted. This involved respondents being sent a copy of the strategy newsletter, followed by a computer-aided interview. Although some clarification of the scoring procedure was requested, a key message was that 57% of respondents appear to have been broadly supportive of the strategy, although some concerns were expressed in relation to charging elements.

12. The following geographical based responses were also noted along the corridor

- Southampton to Havant – highest levels of support for improving interchange facilities at rail stations, and lowest recordings for introducing cordon charges in Southampton & Portsmouth
- Chichester to Worthing – High scores in support for improving interchanges between rail and bus and for removing bottlenecks on the A27, and lowest recordings for making the car more expensive and introducing cordon charging.
- Brighton/Hove to Bexhill – High scores again recorded for improvements to rail and bus interchange facilities and marginal support for maintaining short stay parking charges in Brighton & Hove.
- Hastings to Thanet – a net level of support for improvements.

Conclusions – respondents broadly supportive of strategy and elements but disliked charging mechanisms.

*Media Feedback*

13. A short presentation of media involvement in the consultation was provided. This detailed that, whilst the earlier stages of media activity had tended to concentrate on the building of contacts, the third stage of strategy consultation had focussed on developing these contacts to provide good press coverage via print, radio and TV. Coverage had been geared for each sub-region in the corridor, with particular emphasis placed on the inclusiveness of the approach, particularly in incorporating a trade press and business input.

14. The consultants also noted that the coverage to date has raised expectations, and that in the remainder of the study, these would need to be actively managed through providing effective feedback and press releases.

### **Delivery and Institutional Presentation**

15. The consultants presented a paper on possible approaches to the delivery of the SDP elements, and their thoughts as to the current institutional frameworks, and how these might be most effectively utilised / amended to provide the partnership approach likely to be necessary in the delivery of key schemes. The presentation was general in outlook and scope, although contained views on the potential value of sub-regional transport authorities, particularly in the effective delivery of public transport initiatives.

16. The Steering group raised concerns that the analysis was too general and that the consultant should instead concentrate on the detail of delivery of specific strategy elements, and as necessary highlight any institutional / legislative barriers that may exist for effective delivery.

### **AOB**

17. A concern was expressed that following the formal period of consultation on the South Downs National Park proposals, little consideration seems to have been given to the concerns raised on the likely boundary of the National Park.

18. The next steering group meeting is arranged for 4 July at GOSE offices.